

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1971

November 15, 1971

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 15, 1971" (1971). *Minutes*. 483.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/483

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

E A S T E R N I L L I N O I S U N I V E R S I T Y

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of November 15, 1971

MEMBERS PRESENT: Read, Hattabaugh, Trank, Elliott, Lenihan, Maurer,
 Katsimpalis, Kluge, Shuff, C. Smith, Barford,
 Whalin

MEMBERS ABSENT: Downs, Owens

STUDENT OBSERVERS: Alan Grosboll

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Whitlow. The minutes of November 8, 1971 were approved as published.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Council of Faculties

R. Hennings, Chairman, reported on the resolutions passed by the Council and topics under consideration. The gist of the resolutions passed were in regard to the Council's opposition to any priority ranking of existing programs for the purpose of eliminating them and a request to the Board of Governors to urge the appropriate State governmental bodies to avoid the appropriation of the State Universities Retirement Systems reserve funds for any other reason. Topics under consideration include:

- a. budget needs,
- b. the enforcement of Board policies on each campus, and
- c. Definition of Faculty Status

The latter refers to the erosion of faculty status at Governor's State and the need for job security for non-teaching personnel. Other matters of concern to the Council include common employment contracts, personnel files open to the individual, salary improvement, faculty-administrative ratios, collective bargaining and implementation of the State Insurance Program.

2. Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Higher Education

R. White, Eastern's representative to the Committee reported on a meeting held in Chicago, October 15, 1971. This was the last meeting of the FAC sponsored by the Board of Higher Education because of insufficient travel funds. The majority of the discussion was devoted to the final report of Committee N on governing structure of higher education. The FAC approved six of Committee N's recommendations plus two others with modifications. Steven Sample, Associate Director of the Board of Higher Education was present to review the status of new programs. He stated the pipeline was completely blocked except for programs in junior colleges and in health education.

3. Ad hoc Committee on Election of Department Chairman

Lenihan presented the committee's draft of the Guidelines for the Election of Department Chairman. A motion was made by Lenihan

and seconded by C. Smith to publish the guidelines and invite comments from the faculty. The motion passed with 11 yes and 1 no. Maurer made a motion which was seconded by Shuff to add this item to the agenda. The motion passed unanimously. The guidelines are as follows:

PREAMBLE

In keeping with the following policy statement, approved by the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities on 13 May, 1971,

Each institution under the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities shall, through its faculty senate or comparable body, formulate policies concerning the selection and retention of department (basic instructional unit) heads or chairmen.

The chairman or head, who serves as the chief representative of his department (basic instructional unit) within an institution, shall be selected either by a department election or by appointment following consultation, including secret balloting, with members of the department and general consultation with members of related departments. Appointments shall normally be in conformity with department members' judgment except where there are sound professional reasons to do otherwise which are stated in detail.

The ad hoc Committee on Department Chairmen recommends the following guidelines:

GENERAL PROCEDURES

1. A. The department chairman shall be elected by a secret ballot of all eligible department members with a simple majority of those eligible to vote required to elect.
- B. Each department shall establish in writing its own nomination and election procedures. The procedures, which shall be democratic in structure and implementation, shall be approved by the Faculty Senate. The procedures shall provide for possible choice from outside as well as from within the department.

TERM OF OFFICE

2. The person elected shall serve a three year term with a maximum of two consecutive terms permitted. A former chairman may be re-elected if at least three years have elapsed since last serving as chairman.

ELIGIBILITY

3. A. All continuing full time staff with more than one year of service shall be eligible to nominate and to elect.
- B. Persons on joint appointments shall be counted as members of the department in which they taught a majority of their time over the previous academic year, except that coordinators shall vote in the department of their subject matter discipline, but shall choose one department permanently. Persons on sabbatical leave shall be eligible to vote if they request in writing an absentee ballot from the department chairman.

REVIEW

4. A. The results of the balloting shall be forwarded to the President via the appropriate Dean and the Provost, each of whom may include comments if he wishes.
- B. If either the Dean or the Provost has substantial objections to the person chosen by the majority of the department, he shall give those objections in writing to the University Personnel Committee. A report of objections and the University Personnel Committee's recommendations shall be forwarded to the President.
- C. After receipt of the result of the balloting and accompanying comments, the President shall announce his decision.
- D. If the Department's decision is not upheld, the President shall instruct the Department to begin the nomination and election procedure anew.

TIMING OF ELECTIONS

5. A. The written procedure of the various departments shall specify that the elections shall be held in the winter quarter.
- B. The first elections should be scheduled so that approximately one third of the departments in each school--as determined by the Faculty Senate--hold elections each year for the next three years. The first election should include all departments without a permanent head. The remainder of the first third should occur in those departments where the current head has had the longest continuous service as head.

EXECUTIVE REPORT

1. The Board of Governors will meet in Chicago on Wednesday and Thursday,

November 17 & 18, 1971. New officers will be elected as there are three new members appointed by Governor Ogilvie.

2. A special meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held Monday, November 22, 1971 at the usual time.
3. Chairman Whitlow reported on a meeting with President Fite which involved a discussion of a possible reorganization of governance with the creation of a University Senate. Kluge presented a plan for a temporary University Senate. Lenihan made a motion which was seconded by C. Smith to publish the proposal and request comments from faculty. In addition, a copy should be forwarded to the Steering Committee of the Senate of University Administrators and the Student Senate for their consideration. The motion passed with 8 yes, 2 no and 2 abstentions. The proposal is as follows:

Eastern Illinois University has experienced a rapid growth during the past ten years in terms of student enrollment, number of faculty, number of administrators as well as an increase in the size of the physical plant. This growth has brought with it a changing philosophy relative to the participation of students, faculty and administrators in University Governance. Members of the University community are presently hindered by the lack of a coordinated input into university decision making. Input at present comes from individuals, groups, organizations, committees, boards and senates. This is a cumbersome approach to what should be a combined effort to participate in decisions which affect all segments of the University community. Thus, I would like to propose the following plan for the immediate formation of a University Senate to temporarily provide a sounding board and advisory group as a channel to University Governance. The following is proposed for your consideration and possible action.

1. The immediate formation of a University Senate with equal representation from the Faculty Senate, Student Senate and proposed Administrative Senate (present members of the Faculty Senate who are classified as administrators would be eligible from the Administrative Senate only). The President and Vice Presidents of the University shall be members of the Senate. The University Senate would be a temporary organization to act as a sounding board for decision making and the development of University policy. The chairmanship would be rotated among the three organizations.
2. The University Senate will appoint the necessary committees to develop a permanent structure for the University Senate and the development of a constitution and By-Laws and/or guidelines for operation. These committees will have equal representation from the groups involved.

3. The three organizations will continue to operate as separate entities according to their present constitutions; however, one of the more salient points to be resolved will be the future of the three present organizations.
4. All decisions on topics discussed by the University Senate will be delayed at least one week for each of the present organizations to advise their representatives.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. From Shuff a summary of his expenses while serving as chairman of the Committee on Fair Financing for Higher Education. A motion was made by Maurer and seconded by Elliott to reimburse Shuff a total of \$185.00 from Faculty Senate funds. The motion passed unanimously.
2. November 8, 1971 minutes of the Council of Instructional Officers.
3. November 10, 1971 minutes of the Council on University Planning. The discussion centered on the proposed Union addition.
4. Copy of a letter to President Fite from Alan Grosboll, Speaker of the Student Senate, regarding the proposed addition to the University Union.
5. Letter from President Fite explaining his reaction to the Faculty Senate's request to delay action on the proposed addition to the University Union. Lenihan made a motion which was seconded by Barford to publish President Fite's letter. The motion carried unanimously. (See appendix 1).

A motion was made by Maurer and seconded by Barford that the Senate Chairman speak against the proposed Union addition at the meeting of the Board of Governors to be held in Chicago, November 17 & 18, 1971, citing information from Mr. McKenna and other information provided. Discussion of the motion involved the relationship between an increase in student fees for the Union and arguments against a possible tuition increase, the changing situation at Eastern, i.e. enrollment to support student fee base, etc. The vote on the motion was 6 yes, 4 no and 1 abstention.

6. A letter from Bernard J. Landwehr, Chairman, Faculty Senate Study Committee, West Liberty State College of West Virginia requesting information about the functions of a faculty senate and its membership.
7. From President Fite "recommending that the Faculty Senate study our overall summer school situation, including the schedule and pertinent related matters." The chairman appointed the following committee to study summer school: Trank, Chairman; Maurer, Downs.
8. From President Fite copies of the individual committee reports of Master Plan, Phase III.
9. A copy of a memo from Bob White to Terry Weidner, Chairman of the CAA.
10. A copy of a letter from Stuart Penn to President Fite on election of department chairmen.

11. The October 22, 1971 minutes of the Men's Athletic Board.
12. The November 4, 1971 minutes of the Student Senate.
13. A letter from Alan Grosboll, Speaker of the Student Senate to reiterate the Student Senate's position on the composition of the Apportionment Board and requesting that the Faculty Senate place the compromise plan presented by former President Doudna (7 voting student members and 3 ex-officio non-voting faculty representatives) on the agenda. A motion was made by Maurer and seconded by Shuff to place the item on the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.
14. From Bob White comments on the proposals of the University Personnel Committee as contained in the minutes of November 8, 1971. (Editorial comment: Apparently the minutes of November 8, 1971 did not make it clear that the comments on Teacher Evaluation were the feelings of P. Scott Smith as a faculty member and did not reflect any action on the part of the University Personnel Committee. Sorry about that!) A motion was made by C. Smith and seconded by Lenihan to publish White's memo. The motion passed with 9 yes, 0 no and 2 abstentions. White's memo is as follows:

I am driven to comment on the University Personnel Committee (UPC) views reported in the Senate minutes for 8 Nov 71. Surely these are not final UPC views? If so, surely the Senate will revise carefully before approving them.

First the matter of student evaluation: I find incredible the proposition that only the elite student should evaluate his instructor. Are we to allow a 2.1 student to teach but allow only a 2.7 student to judge his own teacher? I have long thought that a grade of C is what the average student earns when he tries but average seems not enough. By this measure a student acquiring two B's and two C's isn't qualified to judge his instructors. When do we try the poll tax? It's as reasonable as a "grade" tax on suffrage. Even more incredible is the proposal that the GPA--and thus voting rights--be determined by the "estimate" of the anonymous student. And why 2.7? Why not 3.0? Or 2.88 (which is average in Physics courses)? Or 2.46 (the average in English?) Finally, of what value are student evaluations if all tenured staff vote on tenure/non-retention, yet the student evaluations go only to the department personnel committee? In fact, isn't there some question about having student evaluation in the classroom situation, which means the course isn't over and the evidence isn't in yet--exam not even seen, often the final paper not yet returned, certainly the course grade not yet known?

Then the matter of Department Personnel Committee (DPC) forms: The form speaks of "teaching competence." What of teaching performance? And are all the five criteria of equal importance? Surely scholarship is a consideration, but equal--at Eastern--to teaching? And then department contribution, university contribution, public contribution: Are these of

equal weight among themselves, much less in comparison to teaching and scholarship? How would four "below average" marks balance against "outstanding" in teaching? Who is to decide?

Last, allow my protesting the proposition whereby the department head/chairman is a member of the DPC. If he is a strong leader, or a dangerous one, he will dominate the committee, even as ex officio; if he is not strong, he is in the way, and of no help. For the sake of having the DPC arrive at its own clear judgment, as well as to allow the head/chairman to arrive at his own conclusions separately, I would argue for separate judgments, even though they may often coincide, and surely should be discussed in joint meeting before being forwarded to the UPC. And it doesn't really matter whether the official report or recommendation comes from the DPC or from the head/chairman, only that both views, when different, be put in the pipeline.

Despite all the criticism above, let it be clear that I am appreciative of and pleased about the UPC's and the Senate's attempt to make personnel evaluation at Eastern more just, more even-handed, more humane than it now is. I simply suggest that the most humane is likely to be the most individualized and flexible; uniformity does not solve all problems, and tends more to efficiency than to justice.

OLD BUSINESS

Members of the University Personnel Committee were present to continue their discussion of proposed policies on personnel matters. The presentation was made by P. Scott Smith, Chairman and included the attitude of the personnel committee relative to "Department Members Voting on Tenure for a Candidate." Included were the important ingredients of:

1. Due Process and fairness,
2. Academic Freedom and civil liberties, and
3. at least two-thirds of the tenured faculty employed more than half time must approve a person before tenure is granted.

The members of the personnel committee will attend the special meeting of the Faculty Senate to present information on Salaries and Promotion and Accessibility to Personnel Files.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at noon Monday, November 22, 1971 in the Heritage Room of the University Union.

AGENDA

1. Personnel Matters
 - a. Interim-to-tenure policy

- b. Promotion
 - c. Tenure
 - d. Dismissal
 - e. Election of Department Chairman
2. Classroom Visitation
 3. Registration
 4. Creation and Selection for Administrative Positions
 5. Recognition for Retiring Faculty
 6. Calendar for 1972 Summer Session
 7. Summer Rotation Plan
 8. Teacher Evaluation
 9. Composition of Apportionment Board

Donald A. Kluge

Memorandum

APPENDIX 1

E A S T E R N I L L I N O I S U N I V E R S I T Y

Office of the President

TO Professor Patrick Lenihan DATE November 8, 1971

I have given careful consideration to the request of the Faculty Senate dated November 3, 1971, that construction of the University Union Addition be delayed to permit reconsideration of the proposal. On the basis of my review of the project and of the procedures followed in developing the proposal, I must deny the request.

I appreciate your sincere interest in this matter; but it appears to me that Student Government and the Faculty Senate have each had adequate opportunity during the past two years to participate in the discussions leading to the development of the proposal.

Prior to the fall of 1969, Mr. Brooks, Director of the University Union, worked with a committee of students to determine the need for additional facilities. On October 9, 1969, the University undertook the formal development of the proposal with the first meeting of the University Union Expansion Committee headed by Vice President Schaefer. Representatives of Student Government and staff personnel from Student Affairs served on this committee.

The Board of Governors approved a request by President Doudna on November 21, 1969, that a feasibility study of the project be made. I am advised that concerned groups from both on and off campus were consulted during the next twelve month period as to the most advantageous and useful features to be included in the structure.

Upon presentation of a favorable feasibility report to the Board of Governors on February 11, 1971, the Council on University Planning met February 17 and recommended construction of the "basic building." Mr. Midkiff and Mr. Maxson were present as student guests.

A May 6 informational referendum conducted by the Student Senate on the question of the \$3.25 bond revenue fee for the Union Addition was favorable by a margin of 416 to 88; and on that same date, the Student Senate moved to support the referendum opinion by a vote of 16 to 4, with three abstentions. The motion and second were made by Mr. Pranske and Mr. Midkiff.

Following this action, the Board of Governors on July 15 authorized Eastern to proceed with working drawings and to establish the \$3.25 fee to finance the project beginning Fall Quarter, 1973-74.

On September 29, the Union Addition proposal was discussed with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Illinois Board of Higher Education. At that meeting, Mr. Marks and Mr. Maxson offered persuasive and convincing arguments in support of the project.

The proposal for the Addition went to the Board of Higher Education for consideration on October 5, and was approved on that date. However, a series of discussions with the Vice Presidents prompted me to ask the fiscal officer of the Board of Governors for a re-appraisal of the original feasibility study in light of the changing economic conditions.

In an October 15 reply to my request, Mr. John Shields confirmed the results of the earlier study by stating "that with present enrollments and present fiscal conditions the proposed \$4,200,000 bonds for the Union Building Addition and the presently outstanding revenue bonds at EIU would all be fully self-supporting."

The size and scope of the project are based upon enrollment projections fully consistent with existing planning maximums established by the Board of Higher Education. Planning for the Addition considered an enrollment range from 9,500 to 11,000 students. Our anticipated enrollment in 1973, the date the addition is scheduled for completion, is 9,500 students.

Although your communication of November 3 makes no reference to the speculation on the part of some that construction of the addition might contribute to the need for an increase in residence hall charges, I can report that my study convinces me that the self-supporting capabilities of residence halls and the University Union are independent of each other. Factors other than the construction of the Union Addition will determine the need for future residence hall charges.


Gilbert C. Fite

c

cc: Student Senate